

Message

From: Jinot, Jennifer [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D0EDF66A00054AFE84F4AB5C5119562F-JINOT, JENNIFER]
Sent: 4/4/2013 3:30:13 PM
To: Scott, Cheryl [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Fadc62fbfa40409d837b3d1e1fdbcc11-Scott, Cheryl]
Subject: RE: ETO Schedule - updated (v3)

thanks, Cheryl. i'd like to come talk to you about this, but i have to finish up some formaldehyde stuff first. also, i brought coconut cupcakes for Karen's birthday (now belated), so save room for one when you have lunch. jj

From: Scott, Cheryl
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 10:47 AM
To: Jinot, Jennifer
Cc: Scott, Cheryl
Subject: FW: ETO Schedule - updated (v3)

Jennifer, I added the 14 days between receiving pre-comments from reviewers and the peer review mtg (see line 15). Is the new version clearer wrt estimated dates? [Note, I have not accounted for Sat/Sun/Holidays, and for final version for DB/CR, will do so] I also tried to merge some peer review deliverables into the tox review schedule (left-hand column highlighted in green). Added estimated date for initial processing of TO - didn't realize yesterday the comment period on interim list and the ERD are estimated to occur around the same time.

From: Scott, Cheryl
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 2:42 PM
To: Ris, Charles
Cc: Jinot, Jennifer; Scott, Cheryl
Subject: FW: ETO Schedule - updated

Charlie, Your question about aligning date/elapsed days for sending materials to panelists jogged some old cobwebs. Karen H's spreadsheet had 30 days and the draft task order has 45 days. I don't remember the reason for the difference, but I updated the spreadsheet to 45 days. The expected date of review meeting is now mid-Oct (as I mentioned earlier) and I updated the spreadsheet with 45 days, instead of 30.

From: Scott, Cheryl
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 1:56 PM
To: Ris, Charles
Cc: Jinot, Jennifer; Scott, Cheryl
Subject: FW: ETO Schedule - updated

Charlie, Aligned schedules for EtO assessment tasks and peer review tasks.

From: Scott, Cheryl
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2013 5:40 PM
To: Ris, Charles; Bussard, David; Perovich, Gina
Cc: Jinot, Jennifer; Scott, Cheryl
Subject: RE: ETO Schedule

I annotated Karen Hammerstrom's Jan schedule used for the IRIS tracking update exercise. Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) Hopefully, she is in the office tomorrow and can do this before the meeting, if these are needed. HERO lit search and tagging are taking longer than expected. The search turned up many hits, but

the large percentage of these are not relevant to the assessment. Tagging using HERO is extremely slow, and it is the tagging of these non-relevant studies that is taking the most time. According to a systematic review process, they do need to be tagged (into the non-relevant category). -- Cheryl

From: Ris, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2013 3:18 PM
To: Scott, Cheryl
Subject: ETO Schedule

The context for tomorrows hurry up meeting is as follows:

From Lynn-

Looks like we are on the hook for 3/6/15 completions in FY13, 14 and 15, respectively.

~~Lets get together and get started on:~~

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)